Filipinos. Yet among them there has been a minority more vocal in early days than at present, who desired to work along more conservative ways and to maintain close relations with the United States. These few were treated by fellow Filipinos as *AmericanlstaSy* this being a derogatory term. As to the non-Christian peoples, the evidence tends to show that either they have no opinion on the question or that they are opposed to the grant of independence. It is not impossible that the reason why so many of the Moros will have nothing to do with the independence movement has been because of the pressure exerted by certain Americans.

While American sentiment in the United States has been nearly equally divided on Philippine independence, no such cleavage has occurred among Americans in the Philippines. Undoubtedly a large majority of the Americans living in the Islands have either actively opposed early independence or have given it no assistance. The formation of an adequate Philippine policy along liberal lines was for many years stoutly resisted by Americans with business interests in the Philippines. A regular campaign to thwart the agitation for Philippine independence was financed from Manila. One of the arguments much favored was that since the Philippine Islands were a part of the American domain, they could only be alienated by a constitutional amendment. In one pamphlet distributed by the American Chamber of Commerce in 1924 it was said, "We are here by right, we are here by conquest and we have a title by conquest and a

title by purchase. We are here as possessors, and we are here as sovereigns -7 we are here as owners and controllers of absolute sovereignty." The only manifest effect of this sort of propaganda was to irritate the Filipinos and to induce them to put forth greater efforts to secure their independence.

In recent years the propaganda of the retentionists has been overshadowed by propaganda emanating from American interests in the United States intended to hasten the grant of